

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/763,585	CABRERA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Elmira Mehrmanesh. (3) Thomas Bonacci.
 (2) Jens Jenkins. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: ____.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 17 and 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Koizumi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,789,986).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of invention over prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary

In an applicant initiated personal interview on October 17, 2006, with the applicant's representatives, Jens Jenkins and Thomas Bonacci, the following arguments were presented with regards to claims 1, 17, and 25 of the present application discussing the prior art Koizumi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,789,986).

Applicant's representatives proposed a draft amendment of claims 1 and 17 to further clarify the invention with regards to the following limitations of:

1. The selective identification of the data fields to be consistency checked by one of the application instance or by the consistency management module.
2. The act of the consistency management module determining that the prompting event has occurred.

As per claim 25, the claim language with regards to 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph and the use of "step for". Applicant's representatives noted that acts or steps performed are functional processes.